

Appl. No. 10/605,499  
Amdt. dated January 24, 2006  
Reply to Office action of November 02, 2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

**Examiner:**

Claim 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant  
5 regards as the invention.

**Response:**

During the electronic filling process, errors apparently occurred that altered the original office copy, altering line 1 of claim 1 from "display device" to "displaydevice", and altering in line 4 of claim 13 from " a silicon " to "asilicon". Applicants appreciate  
10 the corrections of Examiner. In addition, in claims and specification, the term "photo-etching-process" should be altered as " photo-etching process" for correct reading. Moreover, the last two lines of claim 7 and 9 are reworded and no new matter is added. The above-mentioned corrections are listed in the LISTING OF CLAIMS section.

**Examiner:**

15

A substitute specification excluding the claims is required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125(a) because there are numerous misspelled words in the specification. A substitute specification must not contain new matter. The substitute specification must be submitted with marking showing all the changes relative to the immediate prior version of the  
20 specification of record. The text of any added subject matter must be shown by underlining the added text. The text of any deleted matter must be shown by strike-through except that double brackets placed before and after the deleted characters may be used to show deletion of five or fewer consecutive characters. The text of any deleted subject matter must be shown by being placed within double brackets if  
25 strike-through cannot be easily perceived. An accompanying clean version (without marking) and a statement that the substitute specification contains no new matter must

Appl. No. 10/605,499  
Amdt. dated January 24, 2006  
Reply to Office action of November 02, 2005

also be supplied. Numbering the paragraphs of the specification of record is not considered a change that must be shown.

**Response:**

5 An electronic error, occurring during the filing process, introduced numerous grammatical errors into the specification and claims. Subsequently, the Applicants politely requests substituting the corrected specification listed below for the above-identified filed application copy, as per 37 CFR 1.125. As required, a marked version showing changes made to the filed specification is included in this response to the


10 Office action cited above. Moreover, the specification in line 4-5 of paragraph [0036] is reworded. No new matter is introduced by this substitute specification. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. An accompanying clean version of the substitute specification and claim is attached in the appendix.

15

21

Appl. No. 10/605,499  
Amdt. dated January 24, 2006  
Reply to Office action of November 02, 2005

Sincerely yours,



Date: 01/24/2006

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526  
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.  
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562  
Facsimile: 806-498-6673  
e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)